

**REMARKS**

By this Reply, no amendments to the claims have been made. Accordingly, claims 1-40 remain pending in this application. No new matter has been introduced by this Reply.

In the outstanding Office Action mailed on June 8, 2006, claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-18, 22-25, and 33-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,970,472 to Allsop et al. ("Allsop") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,922,676 to Alnwick ("Alnwick"); and claims 5-7, 12-14, 19-21, and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allsop in view of Alnwick and further in view of the article titled "Web Gateway Sites Keep Growing" ("Web"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states:

"Allsop does not expressly disclose accessing said real-time detailed dealer information with said manufacturer server system from a remote dealer system via a middleware application system."

In an attempt to remedy the deficiency in Allsop, the Examiner cites Alnwick.

Also on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states:

"Alnwick discloses accessing said real-time detailed dealer information with said manufacturer server system from a remote dealer server system via a middleware application system (Alnwick: column 14, lines 63 to column 15, line 24)."

The present application claims priority to U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/193,871, filed on March 31, 2000. Thus, in order for Alnwick to qualify as prior art, it must have a date prior to March 31, 2000. Alnwick claims priority to a parent application, Application No. 09/616,531, filed on July 31, 2000, which claims priority to a provisional application, Application No. 60/173,823, filed on December 30, 1999. Thus,

in order for the above-cited portion of Alnwick to qualify as prior art, the Examiner must rely on the filing date of Provisional Application No. 60/173,823, filed on December 30, 1999, to which Alnwick claims the benefit of priority. However, the portion of Alnwick cited by the Examiner is not supported by Provisional Application No. 60/173,823. Thus the portion of Alnwick cited by the Examiner is not entitled to the December 30, 1999 filing date, and, therefore, does not qualify as prior art. Since Alnwick cannot be used as prior art in the manner suggested by the Examiner, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As stated in the outstanding Office Action, Allsop, by itself, does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. As the rejections of each of claims 1-40 relies on Alnwick, and Alnwick does not qualify as prior art, Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made with respect to claims 1-40. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of all of the rejections based on Alnwick, and prompt allowance of the claims. Web does not remedy the deficiencies of Allsop, nor is Web cited for such a purpose.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 7, 2006

By: Elizabeth M. Burke  
Elizabeth M. Burke  
Reg. No. 38,758